

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and II are related as process of making and product made under M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f) and that the product can be made by another and materially different process, such as cutting the pad from a web of extruded material.

However, the Examiner has given no reasons to support the assertion that a light transmitting member which comprises a water-insoluble matrix material in a water-soluble substance dispersed in the water-insoluble matrix material may be coextruded with an abrasive substrate having a polishing surface to form the abrasive pad of the claims of Group I. Therefore, it is submitted that the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 806.05(f) have not been met and it is requested that the claims of Groups I and II be rejoined and examined in the present application.

The Examiner states that the inventions of Groups I and III are related as product and process of use under M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h) and that the process can be used in another and materially different process, such as using the light transmitting member as a visual aid in abrading a surface with a hand held tool.

However, it can be seen that using the light transmitting member as a visual aid in abrading a surface still requires that the abrasive pad of the claims of Group I be used in a polishing method like that of the claims of Group III. Therefore, it is submitted that the requirements of M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h) have not been met and it is requested that the claims of Groups I and III be rejoined and examined in the present application.

Further, if the claims of Group I are ultimately found allowable, it is requested that the claims of Groups II and III be rejoined under M.P.E.P. § 821.04 and allowed in the present application, also.

Further, if the search of the prior art uncovers no art over which the elected species is rejectable, it is requested that the Examiner extend the search under M.P.E.P. § 803.02 to non-elected species.

Finally, Applicants traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that thousands of U.S. patents have issued in which many more than three subclasses have been searched and the Patent and Trademark Office cannot reasonably assert that a burden exists in searching only three subclasses.

Accordingly, for the reasons presented above, it is submitted that the Patent and Trademark Office has failed to meet the burden necessary to sustain the Restriction Requirement. Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Roland E. Martin
Registration No. 48,082